
From: Josh Churchman [mailto:josh.churchman@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, June 09, 2007 1:44 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Regional profile comments

Hi Melissa I heard thru the new grapevine that you are going on a road trip. Please visit all the ports in the northern area and make note of how very different they are as you go south. Point Arena is a “raw” port. The boats are launched off a pier and to leave a boat in the water here overnight is risky. It is a port that serves the community by landing a variety of species.

The next “port” down the road is Anchor Bay. It is hard to find. As you will see it is not a port. All things must go thru surf to reach a boat and not many people try it.

Timber cove is similar in that only the brave unload there. It is also hard to find.

Bodacious Bay, is next. It has changed from Hitchcock’s time of small town terror. All the seagulls are friendly now. This “estuary” was similar to the Bolinas Estuary. Bodega was dredged and Bolinas was not. The document lists Bolinas as a “permanent” estuary but as you will see if the tide is low, Bodega has water and Bolinas does not. Bodega might be facing the same fate of siltation if the jetties and dredging never happened. This is the real northern “port” for our study area.

Marshall is my reason and point of concern about the accuracy and intent of the entire regional profile document in regard to the socio economic picture. Marshall shows large landings, but it is not a community based port. All the landings are for a single species, herring, and all landings are in a single month. This is a very important port because it is the last remaining boatyard. Lost of boats but not too many fishermen. All the boats from Tomales Bay must risk one of the most dangerous bars on the California coast. If you drive in to Dillon Beach the bar is viewable from the road as you approach town. The famous surf spot “shark pit” breaks across the mouth of Tomales Bay.

Bolinas is another forty five minutes down the coast and it too is hard to find. The “locals” have been removing the sign to Bolinas for so long the County finally gave up. This is a community based port with a long and colorful history. The landing data for Bolinas is wrong because the port codes do not appear on fully half of the fish landed here. The fish that are transported to San Francisco by truck have a S.F. port code on the landing receipt as their port of first landing.

Bolinas and Marshall clearly display the misleading picture the data lays out. Once you leave Bolinas you are off into the world of lots of people and traffic and you are on your own.

The other misleading data is in the rockfish species that may benefit from reserves. The document states that six of the seven species of concern are within the study area. Boccaccio, Canary, Cowcod ,Darkblotched, Widow and Yelloweye.. The fact is that none

of these fish live inside of three miles. Some small number of juveniles transit the area but it is not their home. To infer that these fish will benefit in a significant way from a reserve inside three miles is simply wrong. This is not good science and it is very misleading.

The graph on page 64 is telling. If this were the graph showing the population trend for Harbor Seals there would be great concern. I do think this graph is wrong in that there are really fewer fishermen and processors. What is the cost of a coastal community that loses all its fishermen?

Last of all, despite what John said, I still think we need a working definition of “network”. It is in the concept of the law and it clearly does not include the “network” of governmental agencies involved. Broad is OK but un-defined is dangerous.

Hope you save some time for the north coast drive, the farther north you go, the slower life passes by.

Josh